

Exhibit 1

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

| | |
|--|---|
| Page 206 | Page 208 |
| 1 one quick follow-up. | 1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes the |
| 2 FURTHER EXAMINATION | 2 testimony given by Dr. James Kearn. |
| 3 BY MS. HURST: | 3 original discs will be retained by Veritext. We're |
| 4 Q. You've talked about an output produced by | 4 off the record at 3:23 p.m. |
| 5 complements. | 5 (TIME NOTED: 3:23 p.m.) |
| 6 Does that sometime involve the | 6 |
| 7 possibility that two inputs will create synergies | 7 |
| 8 that is more than the sum of their parts? | 8 |
| 9 A. Sure. | 9 ---00--- |
| 10 Q. And so, for example, if you have input J | 10 |
| 11 and input A, and the resulting product is J plus A, | 11 |
| 12 plus synergies, then by combining the two inputs | 12 |
| 13 you've created more value -- | 13 |
| 14 MR. RAGLAND: Objection to form. | 14 |
| 15 Q. (By Ms. Hurst) -- is that right? | 15 |
| 16 A. Correct. | 16 |
| 17 Q. Is it true that the use of non-infringing | 17 |
| 18 alternatives allows the infringer to retain the | 18 |
| 19 value of the synergies, under those circumstances? | 19 |
| 20 MR. RAGLAND: Objection to form. | 20 |
| 21 THE DEPONENT: That's a -- an interesting | 21 |
| 22 question. | 22 |
| 23 The -- the fundamental problem is that if | 23 |
| 24 you have synergies, they're attributed to the | 24 |
| 25 jointness and, therefore, you can't parcel out the | 25 |
| Page 207 | Page 209 |
| 1 contribution of any single thing to the synergy, at | 1 I, Rebecca L. Romano, a Certified Shorthand |
| 2 least not easily. The -- and to the degree that a | 2 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify: |
| 3 counterfactual -- claim to do that, then it | 3 That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me |
| 4 would -- you know, then -- then it would be | 4 at the time and place herein set forth; that any |
| 5 claiming too much. | 5 witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to |
| 6 It's -- it's a hard question because it's | 6 testifying, were administered an oath; that a record of |
| 7 unclear what -- what the -- the counterfactual | 7 the proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand |
| 8 implies about -- about the synergy. | 8 which was thereafter transcribed under my direction; |
| 9 I don't have anything else to say from | 9 that the foregoing transcript is true record of the |
| 10 that. | 10 testimony given. |
| 11 MS. HURST: Let me ask one follow-up. | 11 Further, that if the foregoing pertains to the |
| 12 Q. (By Ms. Hurst) Is there anything about | 12 original transcript of a deposition in a Federal Case, |
| 13 Dr. Leonard's use of the Kim model that attempts to | 13 before completion of the proceedings, review of the |
| 14 account for and allocate synergies as between the | 14 transcript [] was [X] was not requested. |
| 15 input Java and the rest of the -- the Android | 15 I further certify I am neither financially |
| 16 platform? | 16 interested in the action nor a relative or employee of |
| 17 MR. RAGLAND: Objection to form. | 17 any attorney or any party to this action. |
| 18 THE DEPONENT: No. | 18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my |
| 19 MS. HURST: No further questions. | 19 name. |
| 20 MR. COOPER: Okay. For clarity, I take | 20 |
| 21 it the deposition is over? | 21 Dated: March 24, 2016 |
| 22 MS. HURST: From my perspective, you bet. | 22 |
| 23 MR. COOPER: Okay. | 23 |
| 24 MR. RAGLAND: That is correct. | 24 |
| 25 MR. COOPER: Okay. Thank you. | 25 |

53 (Pages 206 - 209)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-567-8658

973-410-4040